

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 09:02:43 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #393
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 30 Mar 93 Volume 93 : Issue 393

Today's Topics:

"CB transplants"
2 meter phone calls? (2 msgs)
Another 3rd Party Question (2 msgs)
ARRL BULLETIN 33 ARLB033
ARRL living in the past? (was Re: motive ...)
Callsign server went where?
D-C Receivers: info???
Help! Harris/PRD 6690A - Bolometers
HY-GAIN ADDRESS
Mobile in a Lumina
My ticket arrived...less than 7 weeks!
Wanted: thoughts on glass mount ants

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 30 Mar 93 12:57:21 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: "CB transplants"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <103360164@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM>, wells@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM (John Wells)
writes:

|>

|> Most of the mundane stuff came from old TV sets of the era. The chassis were
|> steel cake pans that could be bought at the grocery store (they soldered real

|> nice). Some of the parts came from the local Army Surplus store (Crystals and
|> tank coils and such). We used old 5 or 6 tube shortwave radios for receivers.
You mean I wasn't the only 9 year old who did this before he ever heard of
Amateur Radio or even knew you needed a license?? And here I thought I was
unique. ;)

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
| #include <std.disclaimer.h>

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 15:44:03 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!msuinfo!uchinews!att-out!cbnews1!
spf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 16:15:36 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

[This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]

In article <1993Mar30.154403.29055@cbnews1.cb.att.com> spf@cbnews1.cb.att.com
(Steve Frysinger of Blue Feather Farm) writes:
>I thought autopatch could only be used for emergency purposes (and not to
>avoid costs), when it is not possible to get to a pay phone. Judging by
>your comments above, it would be "legal" to autopatch home to tell my
>family I'm stuck in traffic and to start dinner without me. Is this
>correct?

Yes.

This is an outgrowth of the urban legend that it's not legal to use the
autopatch to avoid toll charges. Ever since I first heard this in 1977, I have
never been able to find a regulation stating this, nor has anyone else ever
been able to point one out to me. If you think about it, if it's not legal to
use the autopatch for this purpose, then HF phone patches would not be legal

either - and they have been going on for ages.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system
to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

Date: 30 Mar 93 15:56:16 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Charlie (address unknown....) says:-

>What is the process? I speak with British hams all the time, whats to
>hurt if i send traffic to a friend in England, thats not a ham. Am i
>not supposed to reveal matters of military intelligence?

Until about five years ago, telecommunications was a State monopoly in Britain. In most of Europe it still is a State monopoly. Handling third-party traffic via ham radio would be a breach of the State's monopoly on telecomms, so it is expressly forbidden in the ham licenses of many European states. There are exclusions (such as greetings messages), but regular handling of non-ham traffic by hams is definitely a no-no. The same applies to phone-patches.

Some day, the State monopolies will crumble..... until then, no third party traffic!

-Pete Lucas G6WBJ NERC Computer Services Swindon, England.
pjml%swmis.nsw.ac.uk@nsfnet-relay.ac.uk

'Careful with that VAX, Eugene' -Pink Floyd.

Date: 30 Mar 93 14:32:09 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Another 3rd Party Question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The fact is that in the countries that usually have third party restrictions, the Government (not private enterprise) owns the telecommunications systems as well as the Post Office. As a result they have only "one game in town" in those foreign countries. If

you want to send a telegram (yes some places still process cablegrams) send a message by telephone or communicate in any manner other than in person, u probably use a government facility. They have a monopoly tighter than any US carrier ever had. As a result, they have a strong loby against change in those countries. In most countries they don't have a First Ammendment, so you can't even send data on a commercial channel that is encrypted without giving the government controlled carrier the deciphering key. We don't realize what freedoms we have in this country (USA) until you examine the lack of personal freedom elsewhere. Remember, u are dealing with 3rd party restrictions in countries that still license radio receivers (even though the signal one might hear doesn't originate in that country). Bottom line, is that these places want u to run up toll charges because there is no other choice.

The opinions are my own, and not those of others.
KC2WE S. Taylor

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 03:10:31 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mstar!n8emr!bulletin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 33 ARLB033
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

=====

| Automatic relayed from packet radio via |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-895-2553 |
=====

ZCZC AG74
QST DE W1AW
ARRL BULLETIN 33 ARLB033
FROM ARRL HEADQUARTERS
NEWINGTON CT MARCH 23, 1993
TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS

219-220 NPRM ISSUED

THE FCC HAS ISSUED A NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING TO CREATE A NEW SHARED BAND FOR AMATEURS AT 219-220 MHZ. IN RM-7747 THE COMMISSION WOULD ALLOCATE 219-220 MHZ TO AMATEURS ON A SECONDARY BASIS FOR AMATEUR FOR POINT-TO-POINT FIXED COMMUNICATIONS.

THE FCC SAYS THE NEW ALLOCATION WOULD HELP ALLEVIATE CROWDING IN THE 222-225 MHZ BAND AND WOULD FACILITATE ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL AND

NATIONWIDE BACKBONE NETWORKS FOR AMATEUR PACKET COMMUNICATIONS.

THE FCC PROPOSES REQUIREMENTS TO ENSURE THAT SECONDARY USE OF THE 219-220 MHZ BAND BY AMATEURS DOES NOT INTERFERE WITH PRIMARY AND EXISTING SECONDARY LICENSEES IN THIS AND ADJACENT BANDS.

THE FCC CITES SEVERAL COMMENTERS WHO SUPPORTED THE LEAGUE'S REQUEST, AS WELL AS ONE OPPOSING IT. THE ASSOCIATION FOR MAXIMUM SERVICE TELEVISION (MSTV) SAID THAT NO AMATEUR OPERATIONS SHOULD BE ALLOWED IN THE 216-220 MHZ RANGE BECAUSE OF A POTENTIAL FOR INTERFERENCE TO TV CHANNEL 13 (AT 210-216 MHZ).

THE FCC SAID THAT AMATEUR ACCESS TO THE 216-219 MHZ RANGE IS NOT FEASIBLE BECAUSE OF POTENTIAL INTERFERENCE TO OTHER POINT-TO-POINT SERVICES, AND TO TV CHANNEL 13. THE FCC SAID THAT AMATEURS DO HAVE THE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE TO DESIGN THEIR PACKET SYSTEMS TO OPERATE IN THE 219-220 MHZ BAND WITHOUT INTERFERENCE TO OTHER SERVICES.

THE FCC ALSO AGREED THAT POWER LIMITS SUGGESTED BY THE ARRL IN ITS PETITION (25 WATTS PEP FOR NOVICES, 50 WATTS PEP FOR ALL OTHERS) ''ARE APPROPRIATE AND REASONABLE,'' BUT ARE NOT PROPOSING NOVICES BE PERMITTED TO OPERATE AT 219-220 MHZ.

THE FCC PROPOSED A NOTIFICATION SYSTEM TO PREVENT INTERFERENCE BY AMATEUR STATIONS TO STATIONS IN THE AUTOMATED MARITIME TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS (AMTS) AND IN SOME CASES TO REQUIRE WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM SUCH AMTS STATIONS.

FINALLY, AMATEUR OPERATION IN THE 219-220 MHZ BAND WOULD BE LIMITED TO 56 KILOBAUDS AND A MAXIMUM BANDWIDTH OF 100 KHZ, ALTHOUGH FCC REQUESTS COMMENTS ON RELAXING THE 56-KB LIMIT.

THE COMMENT DEADLINE FOR THIS NPRM IS JUNE 15, 1993. THE REPLY COMMENT DEADLINE IS JULY 15, 1993. MORE INFORMATION ON THIS NPRM WILL APPEAR IN MAY QST. A DETAILED REPORT ON THE LEAGUE'S FILING APPEARS IN QST FOR AUGUST, 1991, PAGE 58.

NNNN

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 14:19:59 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerca.atl.hp.com!edh@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL living in the past? (was Re: motive ...)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <jfhC4onx8.4I4@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:

>2) QST's attitude towards women hams seems to be somewhat condescending.

> The ARRL's intentions seem to be good, but not their implementation.

I suppose some fellow netters will want to respond, but I can speak a little on this subject:

My wife (Dawn-KI5EV Amateur Extra) has been very well treated in all her contacts with ARRL - home and field organization. When we joined the Williamson County ARC, she was appointed Public Relations officer. She was asked to be Net control for several events and weather nets. When Luck Hurder visted Austin, she was one of a small group of public service hams from our county that was asked to visit with him for field input. She was asked to join the VE group. I could site other examples, but the bottom line has been that ARRL related events and people have consistently treated Dawn as just another talented ham; gender has not been an issue.

Cheers & 73 Ed Humphries N5RCK
Hewlett-Packard NARC Atlanta GA

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 16:05:13 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbnews1!dara@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Callsign server went where?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C4oB4G.51E@rahul.net>, davidj@rahul.net (David Josephson) writes:

> Anyone know the current site for the callsign database server?

> marvin.cs.buffalo.edu is not awake.

>

> 73

> David

> WA6NMF

> --

> Josephson Engineering, San Jose California MICROPHONES

> Tel/ 408-238-6062 Fax/ 408-238-6022 INSTRUMENTATION

> email:david@josephson.com ftp info from: rahul.net /pub/davidj/

Instead of "marvin" use "callsign"

Shel WA2UBK

Date: 30 Mar 1993 14:33:09 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!
ag821@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: D-C Receivers: info???

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, dkohn@ub.d.umn.edu (Nhok Evad) says:

>X-Anon-To: rec.radio.amateur.misc
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
>Subject: D-C Receiver: info?
>Summary: looking for recommendations
>Expires:
>Sender: dkohn@ub.d.umn.edu (dave kohn)
>Distribution: world
>Organization: University of Minnesota, Duluth
>Keywords: direct conversion receiver QRP sisu Classic 40
>
>Hi folks,
>
>While looking through an old QST (Aug92), I saw an article (p19+) titled
>"High-Performance Direct-Conversion Receivers." The author (KK7B) designed &
>built two such receivers, naming them "Classic 40" (for 40m band) and "Sisu"
>(for use w/ VFO-controlled QRP transmitters.) The goal was to get the "best
>possible basic receiver performance." He compared their clarity and S/N
>ratio to a CD player.
>
>Does anyone have any experience with either of these receivers? The \$75 kit
>seems not super-extremely tough to assemble, and this would be an inexpensive
>way for me to "test the waters" of CW..
>
>Any advice is appreciated, either via postings or email. Thank you!
>
>Dave Kohn dkohn@ub.d.umn.edu N0UCF/AA
>

Dave,

I would also be very interested in inforamtion. especially if you come up with a mching vfo controlled TX that will put out about 3 watts of clean power and a good TX-Rc circuit .. I would love to build a seup like that .

73s

Jeff, AC4HF

--

Jeff M. Gold, AC4HF
Manager, Academic Computing Support
Tennessee Technological University

Date: 30 Mar 93 16:20:47 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Help! Harris/PRD 6690A - Bolometers
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Lehane, G8KMH asks about the Harris/PRD 6690A RF power meter:

I don't have a schematic for the PRD power meter to help directly with your problem. However, the following discussion may help you troubleshoot your circuit.

A bolometer is a fine platinum wire connected into a bridge circuit and is exposed to RF energy, usually in a waveguide. A small amount of bias current is passed through the bridge and bolometer such that the bridge is balanced when no RF is present. As RF is detected by the bolometer element, its resistance will change causing the bridge to unbalance as a function of the RF power. The bridge unbalance is then measured as a DC offset by an associated DC voltmeter calibrated in RF power.

To trouble shoot your PRD, I suggest the following: Measure the DC voltage presented to the bolometer (disconnected at this time) to determine if bias is available. During this measurement, the power meter, seeing a high resistance bolometer (open circuit), will read full scale. The presence of bias indicates the power supply circuit is functioning. The actual value of voltage should be varied by the bridge zero adjust pot. Next, short the bolometer terminals and the meter should swing negative below scale zero. If the meter does not swing full scale when the bolometer element is removed or below scale when shorted, troubleshoot the voltmeter circuit. The circuit design is very similar to a DC vacuum tube voltmeter.

Hope this helps.

Hugh Wells, W6WTU

Date: 30 Mar 93 15:39:36 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: HY-GAIN ADDRESS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Telex Communications/Hy-Gain
9600 Aldrich Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55420 U.S.A.

Date: 30 Mar 93 16:27:31 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Mobile in a Lumina
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>> ...I'm surprised that no one has responded to your request as I'm sure
that at least 1 ham in this country owns a Lumina. <<

Gil I am probably the culprit here. I did in fact receive several responses
directly and was not sure if there was wide-spread interest in the answers so I
did not post back to Info-Hams. My apologies.

What I got was several people saying that they had not heard anything negative
about transmitting in a Lumina. One response gave me the most hope and I will
include part of it here. Thanks for following up Gil.

From: "Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056" <LEVY@dcd00.fnal.gov> N9RXF

The van is most certainly plastic (and I've heard that GM is planning to go
back to steel 'cause it's cheaper) but the car is definately steel. The
security people here at the lab use Luminas, and I rapped on one on my way
out Friday. Anyone who tells you that the car is plastic is either confusing
it with the van or just plain mistaken.

On your Celebrity, I'm pretty sure that the engine control computer is behind
the glove box. The Lumina's is in the engine compartment. So, if the
electronics were sensitive, I would expect that you would have more problems
with the Celebrity. My Grand Prix has other electronic doodads (compass,
"systems monitor") that are located in the passenger compartment, and they're
not bothered by keying up my HT right next to them (I tried).

--mike (N5PWP)

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 13:36:34 GMT
From: usc!wupost!darwin.sura.net!jabba.ess.harris.com!mlb.semi.harris.com!SU19F!
jhobson@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: My ticket arrived...less than 7 weeks!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Mar29.171845.5432@wvnvms.wvnet.edu> un027713@wvnvms.wvnet.edu
writes:

>It arrived!

<deletes>

>For those still waiting, I tested 2/9, and the ticket has an effective date
>of 3/23 - 6 weeks.

Congratulations! Let's see....I tested 2/20. That's 11 days later so
mine should arrive about 4/9! Thanks for the encouragement and welcome to
the hobby.

>Jack Forester, Jr. N8XVA
>West Virginia University Computing Services
~~~~~

Great call, too! N8 eX-VA

73, Harv Hobson  
WB4NPL/AE

jhobson@su19f.ess.harris.com

-----

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 15:26:14 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Wanted: thoughts on glass mount ants  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <drw-290393204254@129.193.144.86> drw@esl.com (Dave Waters) writes:  
>I'd like some comments on the abilities of the glass mount antennas, as  
>opposed to the traditional thru-the-sheet-metal type of antenna. I'm mainly  
>concerned with receive attenuation. I had no problem drilling the roof to  
>pieces in my old truck, but a new van deserves more respect, so the glass  
>mounts would seem to be the answer. Thanks for any comments, positive or  
>negative. I appreciate your experiences!

There's a bunch of folks out there, drill motors and hole saws in hand, just  
waiting to wreak havoc on your new van's metal, all because they claim that's  
the only way to go.

To them, I politely say: "Bunk!"

I'm running an Avanti 440 MHz glass-mount on my Explorer, and it works just  
fine, thank you. I even switch between a quarter-wave whip in town and the  
collinear on the road, with no problems. (The quarter-wave shows a 2:1 SWR or  
so, but in town, that doesn't matter.) I'm putting about 20 watts or so into  
it, and the amplifier doesn't seem to complain. I have no trouble at all  
receiving. The biggest thing to remember is that, while installing, be liberal  
with the RTV; the double-stick tape is there only to hold things in place  
until the RTV cures.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system  
to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

-----  
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 93 14:37:17 GMT

From: math.fu-berlin.de!news.dfn.de!hpxx.rz.uni-jena.de!th-ilmenau.RZ.TH-  
Ilmenau.DE!systemtechnik.tu-ilmenau.de!tom@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar26.200435.2051@linus.mitre.org>, <C4Iosn.6Hp@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>,  
<1993Mar26.173640.1@vaxc.stevens-tech.edu>nik.t  
Subject : Re: Which keyer chip best?

In Germany those chips are not well known. Could anyone tell me the  
types, suppliers (manufacturers) and average prices of those chips.  
Thank you in advance.

--  
+-----+  
| Thomas Planke | Planke@Systemtechnik.TU-Ilmenau.DE |  
| - - - - - |  
| Technical University Ilmenau | Phone: +49 3677/69-1465 |  
| Dept. of Automation and Systems Engineering | Fax: +49 3677/69-1446 |  
| PF 327, Am Ehrenberg, D-06300 Ilmenau, Germany |  
| - - - - - |  
| (PacketRadio: DL5ATP@DB0RSV.DEU.EU ) ex: Y32JK |  
+-----+

-----  
Date: 30 Mar 1993 16:56:36 GMT  
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar25.125446.13184@ke4zv.uucp>, <1osnf2INNsc@hp-col.col.hp.com>,  
<1993Mar29.212953.24656@ve6mgs.ampr.org>  
Subject : Re: RFD: reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:  
>tcp/ip and other related information ... we have yet to hear anything from  
>anyone on these lists (namely the listserver heads) to indicate one way  
>or the other. rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip will \*die\* if none of the  
>lists feel like migrating ...

About six months ago, there was a discussion of whether the tcp-group  
mailing list should migrate to a Usenet newsgroup. The consensus was

that it should NOT; had it been the other way, I'd have created a inet newsgroup then and there.

- Brian

-----  
Date: 30 Mar 93 15:56:50 GMT  
From: data.nas.nasa.gov!taligent!apple!catnip!kc6sss@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu  
  
References <59Bb03A3ce8o00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>, <1993Mar25.125446.13184@ke4zv.uucp>, <8amB03RVcebZ00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>  
Subject : Re: RFD: reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

I agree with the reorganization mailing list's thesis that having a sufficient number of groups leads to better segregation of topics, thus I support the reorganization.

My past experience with this was my creation of rec.autos.tech back in '85 or '86. Rec.autos was slowly being dissolved by the flamewars about radar detectors and 55MPH pushing out the discussion of clutches and alternators. The new group subsequently left all of the flame wars behind while the rest of us talked cars.

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
I thought autopatch could only be used for emergency purposes (and not to avoid costs), when it is not possible to get to a pay phone. Judging by your comments above, it would be "legal" to autopatch home to tell my family I'm stuck in traffic and to start dinner without me. Is this correct?

Steve Frysinger KA2RJF

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #393  
\*\*\*\*\*